

CASTROVILLE

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing efforts to highlight parts of the 23rd District, I rise today to talk about one of the jewels of the 23rd, Castroville, where Texas meets France. One of several settlements founded by Henri Castro in 1844, the Alsatian culture there is still evident. And most people don't know that it was the first county seat of Medina County, serving until 1893.

The population in the 2010 census was only 2,680 people. It is a small town very near a big city, 25 miles west of San Antonio. There are 97 historical buildings in the town. It is a great place for a walking tour.

And if you are looking for recreational relaxation, there are few places better than Castroville, where the Medina River meanders through town. The Medina River was once the border between Texas and Mexico. There are 126 acres of pecan trees and flowers along the Medina River in the Castroville Regional Park and lots and lots of shopping. Castroville Pottery is one of the coolest pottery shops around, where they will show you how to make your own.

Mr. Speaker, around the 23rd District in 1 minute.

OBAMACARE CONTINUES TO HURT SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I hosted a town hall by telephone with constituents to hear their expectations for the President's State of the Union address. The overwhelming message was clear: we must repeal and replace the government health care takeover bill, which destroys jobs.

During the call, I spoke with Annette, a small business owner from Columbia who would like to expand her company and hire more employees. Unfortunately, because of the tax increases imposed by ObamaCare, Annette feels as though the government is single-handedly prohibiting her from creating new jobs.

Annette is not alone. Today, Federal employees received their February pay statements, and one dedicated employee showed me her premium had doubled, putting her family in crisis.

House Republicans have an alternative that repeals the unworkable health care law and replaces it with commonsense solutions that will not deter Annette and millions of other small business owners from creating jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

YOU CAN'T MAKE THIS STUFF UP

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency announced that it is expanding the boundary lines of Wyoming's Wind River Indian Reservation so that it now includes three towns: Kinnear, Riverton, and Pavillion. This decision by the EPA, claiming it had authority under the Clean Air Act, overturned earlier congressional actions that reduced the size of Wind River Indian Reservation and made clear that the neighboring towns were not a part of this reservation.

In a January 6 press release, Wyoming Governor Matt Mead is quoted as having said:

My deep concern is about an administrative agency of the Federal Government altering a State's boundary and going against over 100 years of history and law. This should be a concern to all citizens because, if the EPA can unilaterally take land away from a State, where will it stop?

Where will it stop, indeed. I believe the EPA thinks that it controls anything that touches air or water. They even think they control the boundaries of the Indian nations. You can't make this stuff up.

ISSUES FACING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker for allowing me this 1 hour to talk on some very important subjects that are facing the Nation. We deal with economic issues. We deal with the health care crisis in our country. And Americans right now, as they are watching us on this floor this evening, wonder if they will have a job tomorrow. So many Americans right now are looking at part-time jobs rather than full-time jobs. This is changing their lives, and it is changing what they thought the future would hold for them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the American people that it is not over. Hold on. We know that better days could be ahead. Why? Because economics can change; economic policies can change. And unfortunately, what we have seen coming out of the Obama White House, the economic policies have led to Americans not having the number of hours that they need to be able to provide for their families. They haven't led to the wage increases that they had hoped that they would be able to see.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, very disturbing information has come forward that nearly \$4,000 in a reduction of income has occurred, on average, to American households. From the

time President Obama first came into office in 2008, the average median household income was something like almost \$4,000 more in 2007 than it is today in 2014.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how anyone could see that that is good news or that that is a good deal because with inflation and inflationary values—we all know, Mr. Speaker, that people pay more for gasoline today in 2014 than they did back in 2007. We know that people pay far more today for groceries, Mr. Speaker, in 2014 than they did in 2007. So what the American people need is relief, relief from these inflation-pushed high prices on the American people.

That is why the report that came out on Friday regarding the Keystone pipeline was so important. It confirmed what numerous other studies had already told us before, and it is this:

The Keystone pipeline will not increase carbon emissions here in the United States. It is completely safe. And for the good of the United States of America, for the good of our environment, for the good of job creation, for the good of wage increases in the United States, we should have built Keystone and the pipeline and increased American energy production years ago.

We have the chance now. And so, Mr. Speaker, I call on the Obama administration to implement what the recent State Department report issued on Friday, and it is this: that we can safely go ahead and build the Keystone pipeline.

But I think we need to go much further than that, Mr. Speaker. I think that it would behoove not only this House of Representatives but also the United States Senate and the President of the United States to unify and agree on something that would be so good for all Americans—young and old, rich and poor, Black and White, Latinos—all elements of the United States. We should unite on growing our economy and growing prosperity for the average American. And we can do this, Mr. Speaker, by engaging in an all-of-the-above energy policy whereby we legalize all forms of energy and, in fact, encourage exploration and growth, because we have reports that are issued every single year that come to the same conclusion year after year after year: of all the countries in the world—there are well over 100 countries in the world, and of all the countries in the world, our own government tells us every year in a report that it is the United States of America that has been singularly blessed.

Blessed how, Mr. Speaker? Blessed with an abundance of natural energy resources. Whether it is oil—the United States is blessed with more oil than Saudi Arabia—or whether it is natural gas—the United States of America is blessed with trillions of cubic square feet of natural gas—every day, Mr. Speaker, our scientists and our explorers find more and more of these wonderful natural resources: oil, natural

gas, and coal. And because of the genius of the scientists in the United States, we have cleaner options than ever before to use this fundamental source of energy which is the number one source of energy in the United States, and that is coal.

In my home State of Minnesota, we see that there is a propane crisis. The people in my district are severely curtailed from using this energy resource. And there is also a scarcity of the product as well. I spoke with one individual today on the plane when I was coming in who told me that he was so happy. His mother locked in at about \$1.30 a gallon on propane, and he said there are reports propane could go up to over \$6 a gallon, perhaps even \$7, before the harshest winter in decades in Minnesota and other parts of America, as well, is over.

Let's help the American people's lives, Mr. Speaker. Let's not make life more difficult for the average American. Let's make life better. And we can do that very simply by engaging in an all-of-the-above American energy strategy, whereby, literally millions of high-paying jobs would come online.

Since President Obama came into office, we have seen the average median household income go down, not freeze or stay the same, but actually go down, go down by nearly \$4,000. And, in fact, the average median income of the average American, they now see that their income is 8 percent less today than it was 7 years ago. Rather than that being our story, let's change the narrative, Mr. Speaker. Let's change it for a positive, happy ending for the American people so that when they go to their local gas stations, rather than gas being in excess of \$3 a gallon or in some parts of this country over \$4 a gallon, let's bring that price down, Mr. Speaker, so that it could be \$2 a gallon again. I know that is entirely possible and within our grasp.

But what would be even better is to see the average American's income, including senior citizens on fixed income, to see their incomes go up—their rate of return on their savings, the rate of return on their dividends, their investments that they have tied up, after a lifetime of labor, after a lifetime of doing the right thing, taking their hard-earned money, putting it into savings, putting it into investments, putting it into, for many Americans what is their number one investment, which is their home, seeing Americans' home values rise. Why? Because of having a go-go economy, a growth-based economy, an economy that is growing because, rather than being a consumer of energy from foreign nations, we are, instead, the world's leading supplier of energy resources across the rest of the world.

I know this is possible, Mr. Speaker, and I know that we can unify on this issue—not only fossil fuels but also nuclear reactors.

□ 1930

Just this last week, I spoke with an individual who is an expert in the field of nuclear reactors. Before, in the United States, we relied on large nuclear reactors. In my home State of Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, we have two nuclear reactors in my State that supply somewhere between 20 and 25 percent of all the electricity needs in Minnesota. We are grateful that we have these two reactors that provide emission-free power in our State, but we have a new generation of nuclear reactors that could come online and be available for people all across the United States. Think, in a rural area, where perhaps it is just a few thousand people who perhaps wouldn't have access to nuclear-generated energy, they could have access to new, small, nuclear modules that are effectively able to be put in very unique locations, completely safe, almost—almost—waste-free.

This new generation of nuclear reactors, in my opinion, should be studied and put online in the near future so that we could have yet one more tool in America's energy toolkit. As a matter of fact, the United States could be, again, the leading supplier of this newest generation of modular nuclear reactors to be used and deployed across the world where they are safe, where they can't be compromised, and where very, very little nuclear waste comes forward.

You see, it is exciting, Mr. Speaker, to look at the future when so many of my constituents that I speak to today are worried and nervous about the future. They literally tell me, Congresswoman, I have no idea if my children will be as well off in their future as I am today. Every generation of Americans has been hopeful and optimistic, Mr. Speaker, because they have assumed and taken for granted that their children would be better off economically than they are today. That is all of our hope. I know I feel that for my biological children, and that is my hope and my prayer for our foster children. We want every generation to not only have what we had but to exceed it and shoot for the stars with their ambition, their goals, their dreams and their plans. Isn't that America? Isn't that what defines us, to build the next generation of the next mousetrap, to benefit not only us, not only our children, but to benefit and lift up those among us in the United States who seek to move up the next economic ladder?

You see, that is what can happen with innovation. Pull out a smartphone, if you have a smartphone, and you think of what was available to only the wealthiest among us, you now see in the hands of people at the bottom level of the economic ladder. Yet how much improved are our lives because we have smartphones today that are available to us? Think of the applications, the apps, if you will, that are on smartphones, and how those apps

can be used to increase productivity in the United States, can be used, for instance, on health care to connect us more quickly with a doctor or a nurse or a pharmacy so we can realize the requirements that we need to become healthier individuals.

There are so many great innovations that are just waiting around the corner if we only legalize them, if we only open them up, and if we reject this very heavy hand of government that wants to bureaucratize nearly every element of our lives and cause different aspects of our lives to be far more expensive and have less of an ability to access the newest innovations. Instead, we in the United States need to be what we were for the first several hundred years of our existence, and it is this: nimble—nimble and able to capitalize on the intellect, the raw ideas and the talents that are in the United States. Legal immigration has benefited this country immeasurably, and we embrace with both arms legal immigration and all that has meant for our country. These are just a few of the things that we have to be hopeful about and optimistic about as we go forward in our country.

There are other issues, as well, besides economics, that we grapple with here in the United States. One of those deals with foreign policy, another deals with national security, and another deals with how the United States is viewed across the world. I have spent time with my colleagues, many of whom this last week were across the world trying to meet with world leaders and find out what the concerns are and how we in the United States can advance our mutual interests.

I was privileged to be able to go on a fact-finding trip recently with one of my Democrat colleagues, a wonderful man from Rhode Island, Representative JIM LANGEVIN. JIM is a quadriplegic, and he and I had the privilege of traveling both to Australia and to New Zealand, where we met with our counterparts and also where we could talk about mutual areas where we could work together.

We see the rise in Asia of a new and aggressive China, a China who, for all practical purposes, has been engaging in what some would call cyber espionage and cyber warfare against nations all across the world—not just the United States but against many nations. How can we cooperate, then, with our allies to counter very aggressive steps that could be taken by, for instance, the Chinese or perhaps the Russians or perhaps the Iranians or other nations, North Korea, for instance, who may not have the United States' best interest at heart, who may, in fact, through the use of the Internet, through cyber espionage or through hacking in government computers, be, in essence, stealing some of the United States' most sensitive secrets, secrets that we would not want our adversaries to have? This is a very real issue, Mr. Speaker, and one that needs to be addressed.

That isn't the only form of warfare. There is also economic warfare, where our private businesses, through their own expenditure of funds on research and development, have come up with innovative new products and have, in effect, had the plans, the designs and the processes for those products literally stolen by adversaries—again not with our best interest at heart here in the United States. That information has been taken, and in some cases, we are told, a country like China has built a factory in China or in some other location where all they had to do was steal the raw data from an American company and they could go to work once they had that intellectual property and put to work perhaps a new line of paint, perhaps a new product that was being made in the United States and now is being made more cheaply in China and is undercutting the patents, the protections and the intellectual property that we have in the United States.

Do you see, Mr. Speaker, it is a brave new world that we live in. That is why national security matters, and it is why foreign policy matters. It is why this last weekend at the Munich conference it was very important that we in the United States listened to and paid attention to what it was we were hearing from our foreign partners in the world. We have to recognize the reality of our world. Not everyone has America's best interest at heart. Not all foreign powers want to make sure that it is America's children who will grow up to be the economic and military powerhouse leaders of the world.

You see, many foreign nations would like to see the United States cut down, reduced down, so that we are no longer an economic leader or a military leader. I believe that the United States has been a strong partner in keeping peace across the world for decades. We are not a perfect country. We haven't done everything right. We get that. We recognize that. But I believe that our world has been better off when the United States has been that economic leader and that military leader.

If the United States isn't the leader in the world, who should be? What would peace be like in the world if Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government were the leader holding together world powers? Just imagine for a moment what that would be like. Or imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would it be like if China was the leader holding together world powers? We know what they have done before. By stealing secrets from our government and stealing secrets from private industry, we know what that has done. What would that be like if China was the leading military or economic superpower?

We can't think that this is some far-off future scenario that could never happen. We need to open our eyes, and I think one place that we can open our eyes is listening to what foreign leaders are telling us. What some of my colleagues have told me even as re-

cently as today from some of their travels, foreign travels across the world, is that they have never heard before foreign leaders say to them what they are saying now. Foreign leaders are saying, look, we don't get the United States anymore. We don't understand your foreign policy. We don't understand your national security, because we don't understand who the friends of the United States are anymore. We don't understand who your adversaries are anymore. In fact, we can receive communications from the State Department or the Defense Department or an intelligence department, and we can get three different pictures of the same scenario. Which one should we believe?

There is a problem—and we didn't hear this just once. We have heard this from multiple regions in the world and from multiple world leaders who were scratching their heads, even including former Polish President Lech Walesa, who had said the United States is no longer the political and moral power in the world.

You see, Mr. Speaker, other nations across the world want the United States, a responsible holder of power, to maintain that sense of decency and rule of law and adherence to a common goal of mankind, to prefer peace over war. Sometimes the United States has had to go to war. We have had to go to war in order to stand face to face and toe to toe with some of the most maniacal dictators that have ever been known in human history. That would include a Stalin of Russia, that would include a Mao Tse-tung of China, and that would include an Adolf Hitler of Germany. These maniacal rulers have served to hurt the chances for peace in the world, and yet it is the United States that has chosen to put on the line treasure and blood time after time after time. Once war has ensued—no one wants war, no one prefers war—but once that has ensued, it is the United States through the Marshall Plan that did, in fact, rebuild Europe and feed millions who were starving. It was the United States after World War II, after dropping the bombs in Japan, that went in and helped to rebuild that war-torn country and the difficulty that had ensued.

These aren't easy issues. There is no clean line here of right and wrong. There are difficulties that we grapple with. We get that. But, Mr. Speaker, one thing that we should agree on is that the policies of the United States shouldn't hurt the American people, and they shouldn't hurt people in other countries. Our policies should be ones that help the American people and help to bring about peace with other nations of the world. That should be easy.

That is why this last weekend at the Munich conference I was particularly concerned with our Secretary of State's comments. There was an article that had come out just this weekend regarding our Secretary of State, and I wanted to quote from it. I wanted to be

able to speak a little bit, also, about some other issues that have been in the news. The American people continue to ask me about Benghazi: When are we ever going to get the truth about Benghazi? Just over a week ago, there was an article by the second-in-command in Benghazi who wanted to straighten up the facts and put his view on paper.

That is all very interesting. We want to be able to have time to talk about that, but I think it is also very important that we talk about and listen to America's greatest ally in the world. There is an ally that felt very disrespected and even used the word "offended" after comments that were made at the Munich conference this week by our Secretary of State. Now, in deference to our Secretary of State, followup responses have been that he didn't mean to say what was reported in the media, but I think it is very important that we look at our ally—and this is Israel—and what Israel's response is. Again, I think, Mr. Speaker, we need to look at the context of the remarks that were made by our Secretary of State. Because, you see, if you speak with the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, as I have done numerous times in the last few months, and if you speak to the Foreign Minister of Israel, as I have been privileged to do, to the defense secretary in Israel, as I have been privileged to do, and to the intelligence secretary in Israel, as I have been privileged to do, they have been very strong and united in their view of the greatest existential threat that Israel faces today.

□ 1945

That threat isn't new; it is one that Israel has faced for the last recent years. And it is this: it is Iran with a nuclear weapon, because Iran has stated unequivocally, once they gain access to a nuclear weapon, and potentially the missile means to deliver that weapon, they have announced they will use that weapon against Israel. They will use that weapon against Israel, Israel being about the size of New Jersey. The largest city, Tel Aviv, and the surrounding area provides employment to approximately 80 percent of the Israeli population. So it doesn't take a lot of imagination, Mr. Speaker, to see that it may be the game plan of a nuclear weaponized Iran to drop a nuclear weapon on Tel Aviv and effectively wipe out the Jewish State of Israel in one fell swoop.

If that would happen, we should not kid ourselves, that capability and capacity, I believe, could just as easily be used against our Western partners and allies in the European region. It could be used against Australia, our great ally and friend, and also against New Zealand, our great ally and friend. And it could even be used here in the United States of America.

The rhetoric that has come out of Iran is nothing less than outrageous,

but intentional. The regime has stated, they haven't deviated one iota from their nuclear goals and ambitions—not one iota.

What would that mean for the world if Iran obtained a nuclear weapon? You see, this is a very dangerous, dangerous game that we are playing with Iran.

I absolutely disagree fundamentally with the President's decision under the P5+1 agreement to allow Iran to continue to spin centrifuges and continue to enrich uranium which could be used as a fuel for a nuclear weapon. Iran has not complied with the U.N. resolutions, not at all. They have not.

What is different today under the P5+1? Not much, I would submit. So the worst nightmare for Israel has been realized in that exactly when Iran was being squeezed with economic sanctions, when they were in a position where they were starting to yell “ouch,” that is exactly when the United States and the P5+1 pulled back the pressure and allowed Iran to have some breathing space, breathing space to the tune of billions of dollars of access to grow and prop up Iran's failing economy. This was not the time to give balance to Iran. This was the time to demand cooperation from Iran.

And so what is happening now is that we see people from all over the world—China, Russia, various nations—are all buying plane tickets to run to Iran to conduct economic deals because, you see, under the previous sanction's regime, nations were prevented from constructing economic deals because it would help build up Iran. Now, it is an open-court press to engage in economic commerce with Iran. That is building up Iran, and it is causing Iran to have less incentive to come to the table and stop their program of enriching uranium, of spinning centrifuges, and they are not in any way dismantling their current nuclear program.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said, it is his worst day in 10 years. He said this is the deal of the century for Iran.

Why is it we would fail to listen to our number one ally in the world, Israel, on this topic of a nuclear weaponized Iran? Why wouldn't we listen to their concerns? Why—Israel, which is far more vulnerable to Iran with a nuclear weapon—wouldn't we take those concerns into account?

Well, I think it is revealing what happened this last weekend at the Munich conference because you see, Mr. Speaker, one government minister in Israel called Secretary of State Kerry's statements “offensive.” At the conference the Secretary said, and I quote from the article that was published this weekend:

You see, for Israel, there is an increasing delegitimization campaign that has been building up.

In other words, there is an effort to delegitimize Israel. People are very sensitive to it. There are talks of boycotts and other kinds of things. Are we all going to be better off with all of that? The Intelligence Minister,

Steinitz, in Israel yesterday morning said:

Israel cannot be pressured to negotiate with a gun against its head.

In other words, economic boycotts from the European Union, from sanctions, and also from divestment campaigns.

Now, let's just think about this for a moment. Boycotts, boycotting Israel's products. Approximately 30 percent, I am told, of economic trade that Israel engages in comes from Europe. If there is a boycott that comes from the EU, this will severely handicap Israel's economy, and yet it seems Secretary of State Kerry was threatening Israel with an economic boycott.

What about sanctions? Sanctions. Isn't it the mother of all ironies that sanctions, by agreement of the United States, have been lifted from what arguably is the United States' greatest adversary, a nuclear weaponized Iran, and also Israel's greatest adversary, a nuclear weaponized Iran? We would lift sanctions, ironically, against a rogue regime with announced intentions to annihilate people across the world, the Jewish State of Israel, the United States of America; the Jewish State of Israel being the little Satan and the United States of America being denominated the great Satan. So we would lift sanctions on this maniacal nation, a nuclear Iran, and yet we would threaten sanctions or the possibility of sanctions from the EU against America's greatest ally, Israel? Isn't that one of the most severe ironies of all time? This being the greatest existential threat to the world, Iran with a nuclear weapon. How could it be that our Secretary of State could bring this up to the world at the Munich conference this last weekend, the specter of a boycott against Israel, sanctions against Israel, and the potential of a divestment campaign analogous to South Africa which actually engaged in apartheid.

And yet in Israel, what is the so-called apartheid when the Palestinians can work in the State of Israel? Palestinians are allowed to live in the Jewish State of Israel. There is an effort of coexistence from the Jewish State of Israel. And yet what has the Palestinian Authority done? They have thumbed their nose at the Oslo Accord. They have thumbed their nose. Have they fulfilled the requirements on the Palestinians? No, they have not.

What did Israel do? Israel took land in the Gaza area, which is on the Mediterranean Sea. They withdrew Israeli settlers from Gaza and gave the land over to the Palestinian Authority in exchange for peace. What sort of peace did Israel realize by actually giving up that land to the Palestinian Authority? They were met with rockets fired in the region near Beersheba and Sderot. Those areas continue to have thousands of rockets pointed at them.

Who, I ask, Mr. Speaker, is the aggressor in this situation? Who, I ask, Mr. Speaker, should be the one to re-

ceive economic boycotts or sanctions or divestment? Would it be Israel, which is not being the aggressor with rockets against Gaza, or should it be Gaza?

You see, these rockets are hidden in neighborhoods. They are hidden in nursing homes by the Palestinians. They are hidden in areas where civilians are kept. And these rockets are not fired at military targets, Mr. Speaker, by the Palestinians. They are specifically targeted at elementary schools, at nursing homes in Israel, and at innocent human life. Think of this.

And our Secretary of State this weekend, in effect, threatened Israel with boycotts, economic sanctions, and divestment. No wonder the Israelis were so extremely upset with our Secretary of State. Even the economic minister, Naftali Bennett, whom I had the privilege of meeting on one of my recent trips, had a message for all of the advice givers:

Never has a nation abandoned their land because of economic threats. We are no different.

In other words, be warned, Israel will not give up further land no matter what the threats are. And the United States, which purports to be Israel's best friend, should not be the one rattling the saber with economic threats.

Naftali Bennett went on to say:

Only security will ensure economic stability, not a terrorist state next to Ben Gurion Airport. We expect our friends around the world to stand beside us and against anti-Semitic efforts targeting Israel, and not for them to be their amplifier.

That is how those words were received in this very volatile part of the world. Even Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu weighed in on our Secretary of State's boycott threats, primarily coming from Europe, during his Cabinet meeting. According to a transcript of the Prime Minister's remarks on the Prime Minister's Web site, he called any attempts to boycott Israel “immoral and unjust.”

“They will not achieve their goal,” the Prime Minister said. “First, they cause the Palestinians to adhere to their intransigent positions, and thus push peace further away.”

You see, these are not big asks for reasonable people to consider. You see, the Palestinian Authority is being asked to recognize the right to exist for the Jewish State of Israel—the right to exist. They don't even want to accept that the Jewish State of Israel has the right to exist. That is number one. Number two, does the Jewish State of Israel have the right to defend herself from aggression? They won't even admit that she has the right to defend herself from aggression.

Maybe it would help if Hamas, which is the ruling authority over Gaza, maybe it would help if they remove article 7 from their charter, which calls for the annihilation of the Jewish people, the extermination of the Jewish people. There isn't much difference between the call in the Hamas charter,

which is the final solution, the riddance of the Jewish people in the Jewish State of Israel, there isn't much difference between that and what a maniacal leader tried to accomplish during World War II. And yet these same terrorists are being given deference in the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations.

It is bizarre to think that the United States and the policy of the United States since 2008 has included calling on Israel to retreat and give up even more land to the Palestinians, which have repeatedly called for the annihilation of the Jewish state. It is amazing that the United States and our President has called on Israel to withdraw to the pre-1967 borders, which would be a suicide mission.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I have been to Israel. I have literally stood in an apartment building where I can look out the front window of the apartment and see the Mediterranean Sea and the border of Israel on the west, and look out the window in the rear of the apartment and see Israel's border on the east with the Golan Heights, about a 9-mile width.

□ 2000

What country could defend itself, especially when the call is that the Palestinian Authority seeks to unite both the area of Judea and Samaria with Gaza, and they want a highway to do that? In other words, Israel is being called upon to cut herself in two. If she cuts herself in two, just like any human body, she couldn't go on, she couldn't survive, she couldn't live.

So these requests that are coming—in fact, those demands that are coming from the Palestinian Authority—should be shut down by the United States of America. That is where the delegitimization should come, Mr. Speaker, not delegitimizing Israel because she has a goal of the existence of the Jewish state. Shouldn't Israel have that right to continue and preserve itself as the Jewish State of Israel? Isn't that a worthy goal? Should we agree with that?

Why should we be undercutting that goal when the so-called partner in peace, the Palestinian Authority, is unwilling to even work with step one? I understand the response from leaders in Israel this weekend—I understand it—because, in effect, what they are saying is they no longer recognize the United States of America as its friend.

Isn't it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that parallels what many Members of Congress have been hearing from various leaders across the world: We no longer recognize the United States of America; we no longer recognize your foreign policy. Behind closed doors they are telling us they want us to succeed. They want us to remain the world's superpower because we provide literally defense across the world to keep world order. If we are not here as a force for good, then what, then who, then what is the next step? So you see these are not comments made by our ally Israel

and those leaders without cause and without reason.

The Prime Minister said: "They will not achieve their goal"—meaning the boycott and the sanctions and the divestment. "First, they cause the Palestinians to adhere to their intransigent positions and thus push peace further away." True. "Second, no pressure will cause me to concede the vital interests of the State of Israel, especially the security of Israel citizens."

Make no mistake about it: Israel won't give up, Israel is going to stand, Israel is going to be there. So the last nation to put roadblocks in Israel's way should be the United States of America.

Secretary Kerry has a proud record of over three decades of steadfast support for Israel's security.

That is the statement that was released. But the Secretary's words don't add up.

At the conference, Kerry said of the Israel-Palestinian conflict:

Today's status quo absolutely, to a certainty, I promise you 100 percent, cannot be maintained. It's not sustainable. It's illusory. There's a momentary prosperity, there's a momentary peace.

In other words, Secretary Kerry is putting pressure on Israel to make a change, and to make a change whereby putting her sovereignty on the line.

The question is: Will the United States continue to press Israel to withdraw from Judea and Samaria, the Biblical homeland of the Jewish State of Israel?

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why in the world would the United States ask Israel to withdraw from the very location where, according to Biblical and Torah documents, the Jewish State of Israel was begun; where Abraham, the originator of the Jewish State of Israel, where the Jewish people had their origin. Why would Judea and Samaria be that area that is the area that we would expect would be given back to the Palestinian Authority when there has been virtually continuous presence of the Jewish people in that region, albeit to varying degrees?

I had the privilege of standing at Shiloh—or what some people pronounce Shiloh—where the tent of meeting was moved in the interim period between the First Temple period and the Second Temple period on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. The temple was in a tent at Shiloh.

There are artifacts yet today being found, shards of pottery that prove that this location in Judea and Samaria was where the Jewish people had their most holy site, where the Holy of Holies, the Ark of the Covenant, was kept with the tents built around, where worship was conducted for over 350 years by the Jewish people. Yet the Jewish people are told they have to leave that land, the land of their origins, the land of worship for over 3,500 years—they have to leave? It is incredible, it is impossible, it will never be.

One thing that needs to be understood, Mr. Speaker, is the tenacity and

determination and decision of the Jewish people. You see, Mr. Speaker, they have given up before. They have given land for peace. They have given one concession after another. But what they have told me in my visits to Judea and Samaria, no more the people who live there are temporary settlers. They are residents, this is their home, and they have no intention of leaving, and they will fight to the death for their land and for their people and for their ancestors and forebears and, yes, for their children and for the future of the Jewish State of Israel.

You see the Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stood in this Chamber right behind me and stood, Mr. Speaker, at the lectern, and he told a joint session of Congress very clearly that Israel isn't what's wrong with the Middle East; Israel is what is right with the Middle East.

I know from experience. The very first time I was privileged to travel to the Jewish State of Israel was the day after I graduated from high school. It was in 1974. I spent my summer in Israel. It was a very different place back then. It was a Third World country. The modern State of Israel was established in 1948 under extremely severe adverse conditions, and they continued to fight for the maintenance of their sovereignty. Why? Because they were continually attacked by their Arab neighbors and continue to remain so to this day.

There is only one Jewish state in the world. There are multiple Arab nations, multiple Muslim nations across the world, as it should be. We recognize the right to exist of Muslim nations. We recognize Iran's right to exist.

Why is it that only the Jewish State of Israel has to struggle for the world to recognize its right to exist? Why is it the only nation in the world that has to struggle to have recognition of its designated capital—Jerusalem. Jerusalem is the eternal undivided city and the undivided capital of the Jewish State of Israel. Yet that appears, once again, to be the bone of contention for the world, Jerusalem. Even so much so that the United States, which is supposed to be Israel's ally and we are supposed to have Israel's back, our Embassy remains in Tel Aviv rather than in Jerusalem.

There are efforts to have our Embassy moved, and I call upon our government, Mr. Speaker, I call upon our President, to demonstrate to Israel that we do have your back, we are your greatest ally, and have the United States move our Embassy into Jerusalem and do it in a fortnight and make it happen and show the world that we literally do have their back.

If we can't do that, Mr. Speaker, I will call upon our administration to at minimum change the State Department's Web site, which, if you look at the map of Israel and if you look at the capital Jerusalem, Jerusalem is not designated Israel; it is considered an international up-for-grabs area. Really?

Jerusalem is contiguously surrounded by the Jewish State of Israel. How could this not be the very navel of the Jewish State of Israel? You see if the United States makes a decision to abandon Israel, as many nations of the world have done, as many nations are crying out for an economic boycott of Israel, economic sanctions against Israel, economic divestment against Israel, as though Israel were a criminal—if the United States, Mr. Speaker, chooses to join that extremely misguided, wrongheaded void of all facts, then I make a prediction, Mr. Speaker: that the United States will be adversely affected economically, and I believe that we could see adversity militarily against the United States as well.

There has always been one great defender of the Jewish state and of the Jewish people. That defender has been listed throughout antiquity, and Israel has had her back held by a force stronger than the United States. That strong right arm will remain for Israel. That defender will remain. The question is what will be the destiny of the United States? Will our destiny be one of blessing or will our destiny be one of adversity?

I think we need to be very clear and very careful in how we deal with the Jewish State of Israel. Israel must never be betrayed, and the United States must not put pressure on the Jewish State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go over just a brief timeline that I put together of Jewish and Israeli concessions and foreign demands that have been put on the Jewish State of Israel.

You can go back to 1917 with the Balfour Declaration.

Go back to 1920. There were Arab attacks on peaceful Jewish settlements in the northern part of the British-controlled Palestine, where seven Jews were killed. The British military administration urged the disbanding of the Zionist commission, created to assist the British authorities in giving effect to the Balfour Declaration, promising the upbuilding of a Jewish national home in Palestine. The British military administration was replaced by a League of Nations mandate. It was Israel that was betrayed.

In 1921, anti-Jewish riots occurred in Jaffa on the Mediterranean, orchestrated by the British-installed Mufti of Jerusalem by the head of the Muslim community. They took the lives of 43 Jews in that effort in 1921. The British temporarily suspended Jewish immigration into Israel.

In 1922, Britain removed all of Palestine east of the Jordan. Seventy-eight percent of Palestine was removed from the territory of the League of Nations mandate for Palestine and power transferred to Emir Abdullah, who established the Emirate, later called Transjordan.

In 1929, a campaign of false rumor and propaganda, orchestrated by the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj-Amin el-

Husseini, alleged that Jews demonstrated at the Western Wall to curse Mohammed. Never happened. That mosques had been attacked by Jews. Never happened. That others would soon be attacked. A massive anti-Jewish pogrom convulsed Palestine in which 133 Jews were murdered by Arab mobs. The British suppressed the assaults, they killed 110 Palestinian Arabs. The British Shaw Commission ignored evidence of the Mufti's orchestration of the violence and recommended reducing Jewish immigration, and blamed the Jews for the murderous violence against them.

In 1939, a commission that investigated the Arab Revolt recommend creating a Jewish state in 20 percent of the British Mandate, with 80 percent of the mandate to be placed under Arab control and incorporated into the Transjordan. The Arab world rejected that—in other words, the Palestinian homeland rejected it—and the Arab Revolt continued.

In 1939, the St. James Conference was attended by the Zionist and Palestinian Arab leadership. Again, the Arab parties refused to sit in the same room with the Zionist representatives. No solution was reached. A paper was written. Further Jewish immigration would have to be dependent upon Arab approval.

□ 2015

In 1947, the United Nations proposed partitioning the British mandate. The plan was accepted by the Zionist movement. It was rejected by all Arab parties. Again, 6,000 Jews—1 percent of the Israeli population—were killed in a war in May of 1948 when Israel declared herself the Jewish state. That was her entrée into statehood and sovereignty. Israel has fought for her sovereignty ever since and has been under attack by our Arab neighbors ever since.

In 1949, Arab belligerents other than Iraq signed an armistice agreement with Israel. All refused to recognize Israel. All refused to negotiate a solution to the Palestinian-Arab refugee problem created by the first Arab-Israeli war that was launched by the Arab States. The Arab war on Israel created 700,000 Palestinian-Arab refugees. Most were confined to Palestinian refugee camps in neighboring Arab States, and 50,000 remain alive today—only 50,000. The oft-heard figure of 4 or 5 million Palestinian refugees includes, contrary to any other refugee case in the world, not only the actual refugees but generations of their offspring. Today, we have refugees from the Syrian conflict. Only the current refugees are included, not multiple generations. This is not true with the Palestinians. The U.N. called on Resolution 194, calling for returning refugees between the context of an Israeli-Arab peace, and all Arabs opposed that resolution.

On and on we go, Mr. Speaker, to the present time, including the most recent demand by Secretary of State Kerry against the Israelis that the

Israelis had to release over 100 terrorists, many of whom were murderers, who had killed innocent Israelis, including an American citizen. The United States Government put pressure on the Israeli Government to release known murderous terrorists and thugs in exchange for—what?—other Israeli prisoners to be returned to Israel? No, Mr. Speaker. It was in return for the Palestinians to sit down at the negotiating table, and they did.

Once again, Israel disadvantaged herself and released murderous terrorists in order to get the Palestinian Authority to just come to the table. What has been the goal of the Palestinian Authority? Delay, wait, change the terms, move the goalpost, never getting to a point of actually coming to an agreement.

We have the instance in '47-'50 of Jews in Arab lands being told that they had to flee violence and persecution.

In 1956, Israel captured the Sinai and then later returned it to Egypt. In 1957, Israel withdrew from all of the Sinai. In '67, Egyptian demands were met, and that is when Israel returned that land to Egypt. 1973 was the Yom Kippur war. Egypt attacked Israel. Syria attacked Israel. Israel turned the tide with a miracle, and a ceasefire came about. In '79, Israel and Egypt signed a peace treaty with Egypt, and Israel dismantled 5,000 communities.

In 1993 were the Oslo Accords. To this day, they have not been met by the Palestinian partners. In 1994, Israel and the PLO signed the Gaza-Jericho Agreement. Again, the Palestinian Authority repudiated that agreement. In 1995, the Oslo II agreement was, again, repudiated. In 1997, Israel and the PA signed the Hebron agreement. Again, there was no peace, and it was undercut. In 1998, the Wye River Memorandum—undercut. In 1999, the Sharm el-Sheikh agreement—again, undercut.

In 2000–2001, with the Camp David negotiations, again, Israel came in good faith—again, undercut. In 2003, the Roadmap for peace did not call for terrorism-free Palestinian leadership, and terrorists remain in that leadership today. In 2005, as I said earlier, Israel withdrew unilaterally from Gaza and northern Samaria, and 8,000 rockets have attacked Israel in that time. In 2008, Israel made another peace offer to the PA that covered 94 percent of the West Bank. Again, it wasn't enough. The PA wouldn't accept the offer, and it made no counteroffer. You see, the PA is unwilling to say "yes."

That is why this last weekend was so important, Mr. Speaker, and why Secretary of State Kerry's words fell on incredulous ears. In spite of the nuclear agreement with Iran and now with the words that were said this last weekend, we need to make it unmistakable that I as a Member of Congress stand with Israel, as do my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: WHEN WOMEN SUCCEED, AMERICA SUCCEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to lead the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour on: "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds."

I am honored to serve as the co-guest anchor this evening with my colleague and classmate, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY. We realize the importance "when women succeed, America succeeds" has on our economic agenda. I would also like to thank my colleagues Congressman HORSFORD and Congressman JEFFRIES for their assistance in organizing this evening's Special Order hour.

Too many women across America are being left behind in today's economy. As the President so passionately stated in his House floor speech of the state of the Union on Tuesday, today, women make up about half of our workforce, but they still make 77 cents for every dollar a man earns. This is wrong—and in 2014, it is an embarrassment. It is important for me to note: for Black women, the pay gap is even larger. Black women on the average earn only 64 cents to every dollar a man earns.

The President implored Congress, the White House, the businesses from Wall Street to Main Street to come together and give every woman the opportunity she deserves, because, "when women succeed, America succeeds."

Mr. President, I couldn't agree more, and I thank you for adding this statement, this call to action, to your State of the Union.

Many Democrats invited women from across America to attend the State of the Union address or to watch it—women who are among long-term unemployed women who are making a difference in their community, like in my community, a lady by the name of Amelia Caldwell, from the west side, working as a home health aide, or to my guest Karen Morrison, working as an executive in health care. Both must balance the work life, and both understand that we must continue to mentor and provide resources to support women, resources such as health care, child care, equal pay, affordable college tuition, early childhood education, economic development opportunities, and more advocates. Why? Because, when women succeed, America succeeds.

We know that women have made and continue to make great strides, but there is more work to be done. We must provide women with economic security and opportunities that they deserve, that their families need.

I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus chairwoman, MARCIA FUDGE, for her leadership in making this a front-burner issue for the Congressional Black Caucus tonight.

Just think about it. Jeannette Rankin was the first woman elected to Congress in 1917, who stood before this body and said, I may be the first woman to be here, but I won't be the last. She was right. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm was the first Black woman to serve in this body, and was the first in our Nation as a female to run for President of the United States. Leader PELOSI was the highest ranking female elected to serve in American history and was the first female to serve as House Speaker.

America is a much better place because of their service, but there are still far too many women who are left behind. We can help rectify that by making sure that we advocate for women's rights—to have the right to vote, to have pay equity, pay leave, and access to quality child care. This evening, we will have the opportunity to hear many firsthand stories about women and the challenges that they face and how we can help overcome them.

Let me start by introducing my co-guest anchor, ROBIN KELLY, from the Second District of Illinois. Robin is no stranger to the challenges that women face in the workforce. As a former State legislator and administrator and scholar and now a congressional advocate for women, I proudly present the gentlelady from Illinois, and I yield to her.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman BEATTY.

I want to thank all of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus who have joined us here tonight and who continue to fight and serve as the conscience of our Congress.

Mr. Speaker, "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds." It is a simple enough concept, yet it hasn't received the attention it deserves in the policy arena. As we reflect on moments like the fifth anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act—a bill that most of us would agree was long overdue—it is important that we keep in our minds and hearts the critical lesson of that important legislation, which is that it is unacceptable for pay discrimination to exist in our workforce, that workers who face discrimination have a right to claim compensation for the injustices they face, that regardless of gender, race, religion, or sexual identity, we all have a right to be justly compensated for our work, and most importantly, that it is beneficial to our economy, our families, and our children to pay fair wages to all of America's workers.

In that spirit, we must lift up the cause of an economic agenda for women and their families. As we look to grow our economy, let us keep in mind how women drive that growth.

Women are the breadwinners or co-breadwinners in nearly two-thirds of America's families. Women now outnumber men at every level of the higher education ladder. In 1964, only about 40 percent of women were enrolled in

any type of college. Today, that figure is 57 percent. There are, roughly, 3 million more women currently enrolled in college than men. Women-owned businesses, like those owned by Vicky Linko, Letty Velez, and Christie Hefner in Illinois, account for nearly \$3 trillion of the gross domestic product in the United States.

Women are vital to our economic future. Still, the facts on how far we need to go for women to truly achieve the American Dream are staggering.

One in three adult women is living in poverty or on the brink of it. One-quarter of single mothers spend more than half of their incomes on housing compared to one-tenth of single fathers. Of all single mothers, nearly two-thirds are working in low-wage retail, service or administrative jobs that offer little economic support to adequately provide for the needs of their families. Women make only 77 cents for every dollar a man makes—a pay gap that exists even the first year out of college and continues through a woman's life. If you are a woman of color, no matter what your education is, there is that gap, and the gap grows as your education increases. Wage disparities cost American women an estimated \$400,000 to \$2 million in lost wages over a lifetime.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congresswoman KELLY, for providing us with those necessary statistics so we have a better understanding of, when we move forward, how we need to deal with making a difference in the lives of those women.

Now I have the great honor to yield to the gentlelady from Ohio's 11th Congressional District. She is the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus. She is a leader, a lawyer, and an advocate for the people. She leads the largest delegation of the Congressional Black Caucus in its history. We stand 43 strong following her leadership. Please join me as I yield to the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

□ 2030

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so very much, and thank you for yielding.

I want to especially say this evening that as we talk about women, we are anchored tonight by two women, Congresswoman BEATTY, of course, from the great State of Ohio, and Congresswoman KELLY from Illinois. I have had a wonderful opportunity to meet these outstanding women, and I am so pleased that they are here this evening. I thank them again for leading this Special Order hour for the Congressional Black Caucus.

Today, members of the CBC raise our collective voices to advocate for a stronger economy by supporting and investing in working women across America.

My colleagues and I know improving the economic condition of families and communities across the country begins with strengthening the economic position of women, because when women succeed, America succeeds.